

REMARKS

The Office action mailed 18 December 2006, has been received and its contents carefully noted. The pending, claims are 29-36, 38 and 39, were rejected. Claims 31-34 and 36 were withdrawn. By this amendment, claim 38 has been canceled. No statutory new matter has been added. Therefore, reconsideration and entry of the claims as amended are respectfully requested.

Interview of 9 January 2007

Applicants appreciate the Examiner and her supervisor taking the time to conduct a personal interview on 9 January 2007. During the interview, the Examiners agreed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) would be withdrawn upon cancellation of the claim 38. Specifically, since claim 38 is a dependent claim, the previous amendment to claim 38 is not to be considered as an admission as to independent claim 29 and the claims which claim 38 does not depend on (the remaining claims).

The Examiners indicated that they believe that they are able to uncover prior art which will anticipate the claims presented herein and recommended preemptive claim amendments. Applicants have considered the recommendation, but respectively decline to do such as the instant amendment addresses the outstanding rejections, the application is after Final, and therefore any further amendments would likely not be entered which would require an Advisory action rather than a non-final Office action being mailed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated in view of Applicants alleged admission involving the amendment of claim 38.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claim 38 was not an admission that the subject matter of claim 38 is merely a new use for an old device. In addition, as agreed by the Examiners during the Interview of 9 January 2007, the amendment to claim 38 has not bearing on independent claim 29 and the other claims which claim 38 does not depend on. Nevertheless, Applicants have canceled claim 38 in order to advance prosecution. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as pending, are novel.

Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should properly be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding rejections have been overcome and that the claimed invention is novel and unobvious. Therefore, the instant claims should be found allowable over the prior art.

Request for Rejoinder

Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of the withdrawn claims which ultimately depend on claim 29.

Request for Interview


Either a telephonic or an in-person interview is respectfully requested should there be any remaining issues.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 210-380**, Attorney Docket No. **034047.003DIV1 (WRAIR 00-23)**.

Respectfully submitted,



Suzannah K. Sundby
Registration No. 43,172

Date: 16 February 2007
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4332
Fax: (202) 263-4352